

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

MELODY EATON-HOLT,)	
)	CASE NO. 4:19CV1030
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
)	
DOROTHY HENRY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</u>
Defendants.)	<u>ORDER</u>

Pro se Plaintiff Melody Eaton-Hold has filed a civil complaint in this matter against two individuals, Dorothy Henry and John Judin. [ECF No. 1](#). Her one-paragraph complaint does not set forth clear allegations or legal claims. She alleges:

John Judin, Ken Holt’s brother-in-law, did take an insurance policy on my life [and] has stalked me for years through Steven Schermer, former employee of Globe Insurance, [and] that he did coerce black drug pushers from the rescue mission to harass me, after breaking in entering both my former addresses, [and] engineered the theft of a valid State of Ohio I.D.

[Id. at PageID#: 1](#).

“[F]ederal courts have a duty to consider their subject matter jurisdiction in regard to every case and may raise the issue *sua sponte*.” [Answers in Genesis of Ky., Inc. v. Creation Ministries Int’l, Ltd.](#), 556 F.3d 459, 465 (6th Cir. 2009). “If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.” [Fed. R. Civ. P. 12\(h\)\(3\)](#).

A federal court’s jurisdiction is limited to those subject matters that arise either from a federal question of law, or from a dispute between parties from different states (“diversity jurisdiction”). See 28 U.S.C. §§ [1331](#), [1332](#). The plaintiff’s complaint on its face does not allege

(4:19CV1030)

any discernible cause of action arising under federal law. Even assuming she seeks to assert state-law claims for personal injury, as the Civil Cover Sheet she has submitted with her complaint ([ECF No. 1-1](#)) indicates, in order for the Court to exercise diversity jurisdiction over a state-law claim, the matter in controversy must exceed “the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and [be] between . . . citizens of different States.” [28 U.S.C. § 1332\(a\)\(1\)](#).

It is clear from the plaintiff’s pleadings that diversity jurisdiction does not exist. The plaintiff has indicated on her Civil Cover Sheet that she and the defendants are all citizens of Ohio. [ECF No. 1-1](#). In addition, she indicates she seeks \$10,000 of damages, which is less than the threshold, jurisdictional amount-in-controversy requirement of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

Conclusion

Accordingly, this action is *sua sponte* dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. The Court certifies, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(a\)\(3\)](#), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 5, 2019
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson
Benita Y. Pearson
United States District Judge